

RESPONSE
SN 10/081,311
PAGE - 7 of 9 -

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6, 10-13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given United States Patent No. 6,674,756 issued to Rao et al. on January 6, 2004 in view of United States Patent No. 6,738,828 issued to Keats et al. on May 18, 2004.

Claims 7-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,764,955 issued to Doolan on June 9, 1998.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewriting to include the limitations of claims that previously

RESPONSE
SN 10/081,311
PAGE- 8 of 9 -

depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by various arguments that are presented.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 10-13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given United States Patent No. 6,674,756 issued to Rao et al. on January 6, 2004 in view of United States Patent No. 6,738,828 issued to Keats et al. on May 18, 2004.

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 17 explicitly recite a host computer intercepting a command message propagating between a network manager and a router. The command message is translated and the logical router partition expression of the message is replaced with the physical router expression.

Rao et al. does not teach or suggest a host that intercepts command messages destined for a router. Rao et al. does not also translate an intercepted router expression and alter the router expression of the command message to the translated expression.

Keats et al. does not teach or suggest a host that intercepts command messages destined for a router. Keats et al. also does not translate an intercepted router expression and alter the router expression of the command message to the translated expression.

Thus, Rao et al. in view of Keats et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose teach or suggest claims 1, 10 and 17 as a whole. As such, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 17 fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and is patentable thereunder.

Claims 7-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,764,955 issued to Doolan on June 9, 1998.

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reason.

The rejection applies only to dependent claims, and each is predicated on the validity of the rejection of its respective independent claim. Since the rejection of its

449284_1.DOC

RESPONSE

SN 10/081,311

PAGE- 9 of 9 -

corresponding independent claim has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that any additional reference supply that which is missing from Barnard et al. in view of Heath et al. to render the independent claims unpatentable, these grounds of rejection cannot be maintained.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Jasper Kwoh or Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully,

Date:

8/26/06

By

E J Wall

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney

Reg. No. 39,414

732-530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702-4158

449284_1.DOC

BEST AVAILABLE COPY